

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. The Examiner states claims 1-15 [*sic*] are rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-16.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen (United States Patent No. 5,838,907). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 1. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with a logical configuration link stored among a plurality of logical configuration links in a logical link database." While the Examiner cites "(column 5, lines 35-65; Subsystem is a logical link database)," Applicant does not see teaching in the cited portion of the cited reference as to the above-referenced "determining" step. As another example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database." Applicant notes the Examiner has previously stated, "Hansen does not teach creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database and storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database." Now, however, Applicant notes the Examiner cites "(column 15, lines 30-50; Unconnected PCI slot are unassociated connection)" as allegedly disclosing such feature. Applicant notes claim 1 does not recite "unassociated connection." Rather, Applicant notes claim 1 recites, in part, "...when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database." Moreover, Applicant does not see teaching as to "creating a new logical configuration link..." in the cited portion of the cited reference. Thus, Applicant submits the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* showing of anticipation with respect to claim 1.

As another example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database." While the Examiner cites "(column 13, lines 10-30)," Applicant can find no reference to "storing" anything in the cited portion of the cited reference. Rather, Applicant notes the cited portion of the cited reference merely refers to

"...the configuration file for the origination device or entity is reviewed..." "...the configuration file for the destination device or entity is reviewed..." "a determination is made at step 156 that the devices/entities cannot be connected," and "The proposed connection is then deleted...." Thus, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 2. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "selecting a link numbering type for the new logical configuration link." While the Examiner cites "(column 11, lines 13-30; PCI slots are numbered configuration links)," Applicant does not see mention of "selecting a link numbering type for the new logical configuration link." Thus, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 2.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 3. Applicant has submitted argument for the allowability of claims 1 and 2, from which claim 3 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 3 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 4, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 4. While the Examiner cites "(column 11, lines 13-30; PCI slots are numbering type, column 13, lines 28-45; a list of connection interface is un-number type)," Applicant reiterates Applicant's argument with respect to claim 2 and further submits Applicant does not see mention of "an unnumbered type" in the cited portion of the cited reference. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 7. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "modifying a logical configuration link in the logical link database." While the Examiner cites "(column 11, lines 41-53; Editing is modifying)," Applicant notes column 11, line 46 states, in part, "...edit the map...." Applicant further notes column 11, lines 39-44, state, in part, "...if the network administrator decides to go to the network workspace 102 to edit either the blank map initially loaded into the network workspace 102 at step 48 or, if a saved map was retrieved from the map files 16 by executing an 'open file' command at step 52, the retrieved map loaded into the network workspace at step 52,..." Applicant submits such an alleged teaching of "...a logical

"configuration link in the logical link database" is inconsistent with what the Examiner alleged to teach the same with respect to claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 8, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 8. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "deleting a logical configuration link in the logical link database." While the Examiner cites "(column 10, lines 1-20)," Applicant sees reference to "'delete device'" in column 10, line 5, but no other mention of "delete" or "deleting." Applicant submits the Examiner's apparent assertion that "'delete device'" purportedly teaches "deleting a logical configuration link in the logical link database" appears to contradict what the Examiner alleges the cited portions of the cited reference to teach (e.g., with regard to "a logical configuration link") in the rejection of claim 1, from which claim 8 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 9, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 9. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "a logical link database for storing logical configuration links." Applicant notes the Examiner has previously stated, "Hansen does not teach a logical link database for storing logical configuration links." Now, however, without elaborating, the Examiner merely states, "As per claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 1. Supra." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits claim 9 differs in numerous respects from claim 1. Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* showing of anticipation with respect to claim 9. As one example, Applicant sees no allegation by the Examiner, either with respect to claim 9 or with respect to claim 1, that the cited portions of the cited reference disclose "a processing system coupled to the logical link database for accessing the logical link database." Thus, Applicant submits claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 10, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 10. Applicant has submitted argument for the allowability of claim 9, from which claim 10 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 10 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 11, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 11. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "...wherein the processing system determines local interface and next

neighbor information for the network device." While the Examiner cites "(figure 7, items 114, 116, 120, 126, 122, 118, and 124)," Applicant reiterates Applicant's argument with respect to claim 9, from which claim 11 depends, that Applicant sees no allegation by the Examiner, either with respect to claim 9 or with respect to claim 1, that the cited portions of the cited reference disclose "a processing system...." Accordingly, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* showing of anticipation with respect to claim 11 and the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate the subject matter of claim 11. Thus, Applicant submits claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 12, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate the subject matter of claim 12. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "...wherein the processing system determines whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with one of the logical configuration links stored in the logical link database." While the Examiner cites, "(column 15, lines 30-50; Unconnected PCI slot are unassociated connection)," Applicant notes claim 12 does not recite "unassociated connection." Moreover, Applicant submits the Examiner's assertion as to the purported teachings of the cited portions of the cited reference with respect to claim 12 appear to contradict the Examiner's assertions as to the purported teachings of the cited portions of the cited reference with respect to one or more claims from which claim 12 depends, either directly or indirectly. Thus, Applicant submits claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 13, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate the subject matter of claim 13. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "...wherein the processing system creates a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links stored in the logical link database." While the Examiner cites, "(column 13, lines 10-30)," Applicant can find no mention of "creates" in the cited portion of the cited reference. Rather, Applicant notes the cited portion of the cited reference merely refers to "...the configuration file for the origination device or entity is reviewed...," "...the configuration file for the destination device or entity is reviewed...," "a determination is made at step 156 that the devices/entities cannot be connected," and "The proposed connection is then deleted...." Thus, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 13.

Regarding claim 14, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate the subject matter of claim 14. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "...wherein the processing system causes the new logical configuration link to be stored in the logical link database." While the Examiner cites "(column 13, lines 10-30)," Applicant can find no mention of "stored" in the cited portion of the cited reference. Rather, Applicant notes the cited portion of the cited reference merely refers to "...the configuration file for the origination device or entity is reviewed...," "...the configuration file for the destination device or entity is reviewed...," "a determination is made at step 156 that the devices/entities cannot be connected," and "The proposed connection is then deleted...." Thus, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate the subject matter of claim 15. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "...wherein the processing system validates the new logical configuration link." While the Examiner cites "(column 13, lines 10-30)," Applicant can find no mention of "validates the new logical configuration link" in the cited portion of the cited reference. Rather, Applicant notes the cited portion of the cited reference merely refers to "...the configuration file for the origination device or entity is reviewed...," "...the configuration file for the destination device or entity is reviewed...," "a determination is made at step 156 that the devices/entities cannot be connected," and "The proposed connection is then deleted...." Thus, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 15.

Regarding claim 16, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate the subject matter of claim 16. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "...wherein the processing system causes the new logical configuration link to be sent to the network device." While the Examiner cites "(column 14, lines 41-60)," Applicant can find no mention of "causes the new logical configuration link to be sent to the network device" in the cited portion of the cited reference. Rather, Applicant submits the Examiner does not identify any element that the Examiner would purport to teach "the network device." Thus, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 16.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Hansen (United States Patent No. 5,838,907), and further in view of Hardwick (United States Patent No. 5,550,816). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 5, Applicant notes the Examiner acknowledges "Hansen fails to teach the step of selecting a link application from a group consisting of: Internet Protocol Forwarding, Multi-Protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding, and Multi-Protocol Label Switching." The Examiner alleges the Hardwick reference teaches such feature at "(column 43, lines 60- column 44, lines 5)." However, Applicant can find no mention of "Internet Protocol Forwarding," "Multi-Protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding," or "Multi-Protocol Label Switching" in the cited portion of the Hardwick reference. Thus, Applicant submits the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to claim 5. Also, while the Examiner states as a purported motivation for attempting to combine the purported teachings "in order to provide a wide variety of access control tools that permit network managers to define the policy of how network group can interact with themselves," Applicant respectfully disagrees that such purported motivation would suggest combination of the alleged teachings of the cited portions of the cited references. Thus, Applicant submits claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hansen (United States Patent No. 5,838,907) in view of Chui (United States Patent No. 2002/0165978). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 6, Applicant notes the Examiner acknowledges "Hansen fails to teach selecting a sub layer interface type further comprising the step of: Selecting the sub-layer interface type from a group consisting of: Packet over Sonet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode, and GigEthernet." The Examiner alleges the Chui reference teaches such feature at "(Paragraph 0201)." However, Applicant can find no mention of "Asynchronous Transfer Mode" or "GigEthernet" in the cited portion of the Chui reference. Even the mention of "SONET" is in the context of "the lightweight SONET layer approach" where "the OIR system will preserve the SONET header as a means of framing the data but will not use the Time Division Multiplexing (TDM) approach to transport payload." Thus, Applicant submits the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to claim 6. Also, while the Examiner states as a purported motivation for attempting to combine the purported teachings "in order to provide a wide variety of access control tools that permit network

managers to define the policy of how network group can interact with themselves," Applicant respectfully disagrees that such purported motivation would suggest combination of the alleged teachings of the cited portions of the cited references. Thus, Applicant submits claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

In Applicant's response to what Applicant considers to be the inappropriately issued Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed 03/16/2006, Applicant petitioned the Commissioner of Patents add the time lost due to the improper issuance of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121) to any patent term adjustment and/or patent term extension to any patent that may issue from the pending application. Applicant also enclosed therewith payment for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) to respond to the improperly issued Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121). However, as Applicant submits Applicant's original response was fully compliant with 37 CFR 1.121, Applicant requested a refund of Applicant's payment. Applicant has received neither of the requested items, Applicant reiterates Applicant's petition and request for such items.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

04-23-2007
Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.
PO Box 164075
Austin, Texas 78716-4075
(512) 347-9223 (phone)
(512) 347-9224 (fax)